
Transportation and Communications Committee
of the
Southern California Association of Governments
April 3, 2008

Minutes

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE. AN AUDIO CASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.

The Transportation and Communications Committee held its meeting at the SCAG office in Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by the Honorable Mike Ten, Vice-Chair. There was a quorum.

Members Present

Ayala, Luis	SGVCOG
Bone, Lou	Tustin
Brown, Art	Buena Park
Buckley, Thomas	Lake Elsinore
Burke, Yvonne	Los Angeles County
Carroll, Stan	La Habra Heights
Chastain, Kelly	SANBAG
Chlebnik, John	WRCOG
Dale, Lawrence	Barstow
Daniels, Gene	Paramount
Diels, Steve	Redondo Beach
Dixon, Richard	Lake Forest
Edgar, Troy	Los Alamitos
Gabelich, Rae	Long Beach
Garcia, Lee Ann	Grand Terrace
Green, Cathy	OCCOG
Gross, Carol	Culver City
Gurule, Frank	Cudahy
Hack, Bert	TCA
Kelley, Trish	Mission Viejo
Leon, Paul	SANBAG
Masiel, Andrew	Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians
McLean, Marsha	North L.A. County
Messina, Barbara	Alhambra
Millhouse, Keith	VCTC
Mills, Leroy	OCCOG
O'Connor, Pam	Santa Monica
Ovitt, Gary	San Bernardino County
Pettis, Gregory	Cathedral City
Quirk, Sharon	Fullerton
Roberts, Ron	Temecula
Spence, David	Arroyo Verdugo COG
Stone, Jeffrey	Riverside County

Members Present (cont.)

Sykes, Tom	Walnut
Ten, Mike – Vice Chair	South Pasadena
Wapner, Alan - Chair	Ontario

Members Not Present

Aldinger, Jim	Manhattan Beach
Baldwin, Harry	San Gabriel
Beauman, John	Brea
Becerra, Glen	Simi Valley
Dunlap, Judy	Inglewood
Flickinger, Bonnie	Moreno Valley
Glaab, Paul	City of Laguna Niguel
Glancy, Thomas	VCOG
Hahn, Janice	City of Los Angeles
Hernandez, Robert	Anaheim
Lowe, Robin	Hemet/ RCTC
Lowenthal, Bonnie	Long Beach
Martinez, Sharon	SGVCOG
Nuaimi, Mark	SANBAG
Parks, Bernard	Los Angeles
Rutherford, Mark	Las Virgenes/Malibu COG
Smith, Greig	Los Angeles
Wilson, Michael	CVAG

New Members Not Present

Bishop, Joel	Dana Point
Reavis, Gail	Mission Viejo

Voting Members, Non Elected Officials

Nguyen, Lam	Caltrans
-------------	----------

1.0 CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLIGANCE

The Hon. Mike Ten, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Arnold Sachs, City of Lennox, stated that he had read that the Green Line was proposing to reestablish a Green Line Construction Authority. Mr. Sachs pointed out that there was a Crenshaw Corridor rail project proposed without a construction authority. There is a downtown connector to Union Station, which by the way does not connect to Union Station, without a Construction authority. There is an eastside extension that never had a construction authority and still does not. Why is a Green Line Construction Authority needed when these other projects have no construction authority.

The MTA is discussing having routes eliminated and service reductions. Service reductions are currently occurring on routes that are not going to be eliminated. MTA has governance council meetings, they do not discuss the reductions at these meetings, the reduction are not discussed at the MTA board meetings either. The Los Angeles City Council and the Los Angeles County Supervisors have no idea of the reductions. Who

justifies the service reductions for one of the most important routes in the South Bay such as the bus line 232.

In SCAG's current twenty-year Draft RTP there is mention of the highways but there is no mention of any transit housing. This is a huge area contained in other transit agencies transportation plans. Why aren't there any forecasted plans in SCGA RTP?

3.0 REVIEW and PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

4.1 Approval Items

4.1.1 Minutes of March 5, 2008 Meeting

A motion was made (Bone) to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion was SECONDED (Brown) and UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

5.0 ACTION ITEMS

No items.

6.0 AVIATION TASK FORCE REPORT

None

7.0 MAGLEV TASK FORCE REPORT

None

8.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

8.1 2008 RTP Update

Naresh Amatya, SCAG, stated that even though Item 8.1 is placed on the agenda as an Information Item, staff had sent out an e-mail to all the members of the Transportation & Communications Committee them that the agenda does allow the committee to take an action on the RTP if there is a consensus to do so. Since the last special meeting of the TCC on March 19th in which the RTP was discussed and primary focus was on a number of projects, Item 8.1 was intended to continue that discussion. One of the things that has occurred since the March 19th meeting is that as result of EPA asking ARB to resubmit the emission budgets, SCAG has redone the Emissions Analysis of the Draft RTP and released it for 30-day public review and comment. The conformity portion of the Emissions Analysis was posted on March 28th. At this point SCAG's goal is to finalize the discussions on outstanding issues of the Draft RTP and take it to the Regional Council for adoption at the General Assembly on May 8th.

Hon. Mike Ten opened the floor to public comments regarding the Draft RTP.

Mr. Paul Taylor, Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), stated that the City of Anaheim was requesting the support of the TCC for the inclusion of the Anaheim Resort Connector in the strategic component of the RTP. OCTA has an aggressive program in the works encouraging and financing the thirty-four cities in Orange County with their development of local initiatives for public transportation. OCTA applauds any city's effort, and in particular the effort that is being made by the City of Anaheim, to tie into the Regional Inter-Modal Center that OCTA and the City of Anaheim are jointly developing. OCTA believes that the connector from the resort area to the ARTIC (the Regional Inter-Modal Transportation Center) is a crucial component of the public transportation system within Orange County.

A motion (Brown) was made to support the recommendation of the Orange County Transportation Authority supporting the inclusion of the Anaheim Resort Connector in the Strategic portion of the RTP. Motion was SECONDED (Bone) and UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Hon. Ralph Rodriguez, City of La Palma, stated that the City of La Palma was in opposition to the Orangeline Maglev proposal. La Palma supports the continued reduction of the priority of this project. The project has been opposed by three councils in the City of La Palma because La Palma would be the first city in Orange County that the project would impact. La Palma is not entirely opposed to a project along the P&E right-of-way which really does enhance the mass transit opportunities for all of the region's residents both in Los Angeles, Orange County, and beyond. There are many issues and questions surrounding the Orangeline project: 1) What are the actual benefits to the residents of Orange County, 2) the ridership models are hard to justify in comparison to other more worthwhile projects in the area of mass transit, and 3) the financial model, which relies heavily on private investment, continues to be a very soft area. It is hard to justify what would effectively be the public giving of land, on the perspective of Orange County residents, to what effectively is a privately run enterprise. The City of La Palma would like to see the attention, money, and support go to those mass transit projects and high-speed projects that would be of the best benefit for all the residents of all the counties impacted by these particular projects.

Mr. Bill DeWitt, Mayor, City of South Gate, stated that South Gate had been supportive of the Orangeline project for a number of years. South Gate has put a lot of time and money into the project. The Orangeline has been in the RTP for four years. The City of South Gate feels it should not be discriminated against and be given the opportunity to proceed with the project. If Orange County does not want to be part of the project, so be it. Something needs to be done to improve this transportation corridor which has not been used for many years by the railroad, as an opportunity to improve public transportation to allow people to move closer to Downtown L.A. and improve the region's transportation system.

Hon Kirk Cartozian, Councilmember City of Downey and Chairman of the Orangeline High-Speed Maglev, stated that the Orangeline had been in the Constrained RTP since 2004. The cities that compose the Orangeline High-Speed Maglev are not just in Southeast L.A. County, but stretch up to the cities of Palmdale and Santa Clarita. There is contention in Orange County, the point of the matter is that at this late point in the process is not the right time to be pulling the rug out or cutting off a project at the knees. Parity for projects is important, parity for member cities of SCAG is important. The City of Downey would appreciate the committees continued support on this matter.

Yvette Abich, General Counsel, Orangeline Development Authority (OLDA), stated that she wanted to point out three things to the TCC regarding the Orangeline: 1) the OLDA's project, the Orangeline Maglev, meets all the requirements for inclusion in the RTP including the financial constraint portion, 2) the OLDA hopes that the TCC, in its deliberations, be mindful that treatment of the Orangeline project should be done in a way that is fair and equitable to how the committee has treated other Maglev projects that are also included in the RTP, 3) and lastly, I wanted to go on the record to express my disagreement about how this item was agenzized under the Brown Act. The item is listed as an Information Item. There is no indication to the public that any action was going to be taken today, and if there was going to be some action taken today under the Brown Act an Amendment to the Agenda should have been made and posted within the Brown Act time period.

Hon. Alan Wapner then closed public comments for Item 8.1.

Hon. Alan Wapner, stated that what the TCC has before them is a Draft RTP that was circulated and including numerous comments that were received. The Chair stated that pursuant to the comments received, there appeared to be two outstanding issues that need to be taken into consideration today as to whether or not the TCC wants to change its recommendation to the Regional Council that is going before the committee next month. The two items include the CETAP and Orangeline projects.

Hon. Alan Wapner stated that he understood that Riverside and Orange County have reached consensus on how to handle the CETAP.

Naresh Amatya, SCAG, informed the TCC that staff's recommendation is that CETAP Corridor B which is currently included in the Draft RTP as a capital project, be changed to a study project in the Final RTP.

Hon. Alan Wapner clarified for the TCC that the recommendation of Riverside and Orange County is that the capital project move to the Strategic Plan and that a study of the CETAP be included in the Financially Constrained RTP.

Hasan Ikhrata, SCAG, pointed out that the federal rule since the last time the TCC took up this topic had changed. It now allows the project to move forward with it being a study in the Constrained Plan. This way there will be no lost time in the

ability to do a study of the CETAP. This is the conclusion RCTC and OCTA agreed upon when both agencies met with SCAG staff.

Hon. Richard Dixon, Lake Forrest, requested that staff clarify that the new rule does allow the study to be in the Constrained Plan, but the study also needs a funding source. Mr. Ikhata agreed and stated that the project needed funding for the study and the funding source had been identified by both RCTC and OCTA.

A motion (Dixon) was made to reflect that the CETAP Corridor B in the Draft RTP currently included as a capital project, be change to a study project in the Final RTP. The motion was SECONDED (Brown) and UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Hon. Jeff Stone, County of Riverside and Chairman of RCTC, stated that the RCTC concurred with the motion.

Hon. Alan Wapner then took up the Orangeline project. He stated that currently the Orangeline, as a capital project, is included in the RTP. There have been some concerns expressed about the Orangeline with regards to the right-of-way and the Business Plan.

Hon. Richard Dixon requested that Hon. Alan Wapner, Chair, allow staff to make a recommendation because of the technical importance of the project. It is extremely important that the TCC allows SCAG's Executive Director to make recommendations based upon the information that is current as of today.

Rich Macias, SCAG Interim Planning Director, stated that it has come to staff's attention that the MTA is interested in pursuing and supporting the MIS effort along the corridor that is currently slated for the Orangeline in partnership with Orange County. At this time this is all the MTA is willing to commit. It is SCAG's understanding from the Gateway Cities COG, via Mr. Dick Powers, that this is the current situation and status of that effort.

Hon. Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica, stated that the update she had received from the MTA was that while MTA has indicated a willingness to consider use of the L.A. County portion of the right-of-way only when and if the project is funded, and has been environmentally reviewed. The Orangeline is listed in the Strategic Plan or Tier 1 Strategic of the Draft L.A. County Transportation Plan, and not in the funded portion, but there is no promise of representation or pledge to give the right-of-way. Additionally, there is no public sector funding coming for the project. OCTA and MTA are discussing cross corridor planning efforts. A planning study could be done on this corridor that is not currently dedicated to any technology.

Mr. Ikhata replied that there was discussion at the March 19th meeting there was discussion in regards to having the Orangeline L.A. County portion in the Constrained Plan. There was communication with MTA by Mr. Dick Powers, Executive Director of the Gateway Cities COG regarding the project. The current

standing is that neither MTA nor OCTA committed the right-of-way. There is also an issue with the Orangeline's Financial Plan not having money for the right-of-way. The second issue is there is no entity, thus far, that identifies funding for a study. A project in the Strategic Plan does not mean that the project cannot proceed. SCAG wants to work with the COG and the Orangeline Development Authority to make sure that the project proceeds. But at this time, from a technical standpoint, the Orangeline does not have the funding identified for the study for it to be included in the Plan.

Hon. Alan Wapner inquired if the OLDA had any funds for the study. Mr. Al Perdon, Executive Director, OLDA, stated that there was \$280,000 in federal funds allocated for the study. Mr. Ikhrata pointed out to the committee that a major investment study would cost a couple of million dollars.

Hon. Arthur Brown, OCTA, stated that OCTA has made it very clear that it does not intend to allow the Orangeline now and probably forever, unless another OCTA governing board sometime in the future releases it, to use the right-of-way. Orange County already has plans for the right-of-way and does not invite the Orangeline to enter Orange County.

Hon. Marsha McLean, North Los Angeles County, stated that if Orange County is so adamant about not allowing the Orangeline to enter their area, that the Orangeline is a viable project without Orange County. There is no reason to take the project out of the Constrained Plan.

Hon. Alan Wapner asked SCAG staff if the OLDA had submitted a new/revised Business Plan on the Los Angeles portion of the Orangeline Corridor. Richard Marcus, SCAG's Program Manager of the Maglev High-Speed Rail, stated that the OLDA had submitted a document to SCAG yesterday but staff had not had the opportunity to review it.

Hon. Alan Wapner clarified for the TCC that the Strategic Plan is significant portion of the Plan. If a project is in the Strategic Plan, it does not mean that the project is not being considered. Monies can be spent and further studies can be done. When the project becomes ripe, it can be considered as an amendment to the RTP and placed in the RTP at that time.

Hon. Kurt Cartozian pointed out to the TCC that there were two State bills planned to be introduced later this year that are going to be authored by the Hon. Hector DeLaTorre and the Hon. Alan Lowenthal for funding assistance.

Hon. John Chlebnik, Barstow, stated that if the Orangeline meets the criteria for inclusion in the RTP, then the project should be included. If the project does not meet the criteria, then it should not be included. If the Orangeline does not have the funding and does not have the Business Plan, it should then be put into the Strategic Plan and in the meantime, the OLDA should keep moving forward with the project until the project becomes developed.

A motion (Chlebnik) was made to take the Orangeline out of the RTP and put into the Strategic Plan. The motion was SECONDED (Brown) and UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Hon. Gene Daniels, Paramount, commented that he could not believe what he was hearing. The OCTA is saying that there is no way their agency would relinquish the right-of-way in Orange County. I find this statement offensive sure there are other individuals in this body that find it offensive also. The whole idea of SCAG is regional planning and do what is best for the region. In the southeast part of the region there are two and a half million people who depend on this ridership. It is this body's job, and that of the Regional Council, to put petty ideas aside in order to reflect what is good for our region. SCAG's role is regional planning; it is not local planning which is done on the local level.

Hon. Richard Dixon, Lake Forrest and OCTA Board Member, informed the Hon. Gene Daniels that OCTA had been studying the Orangeline Business Plan for quite sometime and the OCTA's decision was based on several of factors. 1) OCTA and MTA are working on a major investment study for the corridor along with all the other corridors that go between Orange County and Los Angeles County. As a result of that, as the study concludes, OCTA is now in the process of beginning to do a Central County Major Investment Study which includes all of the cities. In addition to all of the cities in the central corridor of Orange County, it includes the cities along the PE right-of-way. This morning SCAG's Administration Committee approved a grant to OCTA to allow it to move forward with the investment study for Orange County. Orange County has been looking at regional transportation issues not only with Riverside County but with L.A. County as well. The difference between MTA and OCTA is that OCTA has taken the time to do a detailed analysis of the Orangeline's Business Plan. It was this detailed analysis that helped OCTA board members determine that at this time, not indefinitely but at this time, the Orangeline Business Plan is not feasible. The primary reason OCTA does not support the Orangeline is because its business analysis is insufficient. The current discussion is whether or not the Orangeline meets the guidelines. Staff needs to explain to this body, one way or another, if the project currently meets the guidelines to be in the Constrained Plan. It is incumbent upon this body, no matter how firmly we believe in a project or not, to take a technically responsible action on this project and all other projects. Additionally, should the Orangeline go into the Strategic Plan it is not coming out of the RTP it is just being moved per the current guidelines from one section to another section. The Orangeline can continue to move forward with its planning process, continue working with the MTA, and other cities along that corridor. At such time when the project does meet the guidelines, the RTP can be amended to put the Orangeline into the constrained portion of the RTP.

Hon. Kurt Cartozian stated that OCTA had representation at OLDA's meetings for the last two and a half years. If contentions are being raised, they should not have been raised at the eleventh hour. If the OLDA and OCTA feels it needs to go over the Business Plan and figure out why its Business Plan no longer meets the guidelines, the OLDA deserves this.

Hon. Keith Millhouse, Moorpark, stated that each side has done a good job of articulating their positions. The TCC could have a very lengthy discussion on the Orangeline but the direction of the committee needs to go back to the point of whether or not we can procedurally do any thing with this item today and if not, the TCC should reserve this discussion until it is appropriate.

Hon. Alan Wapner stated that with regards to taking action on this item today, he was surprised when the agenda had the item was listed as an information item with no recommended action. Staff did point out that the agenda does state that any item contained within the agenda can have action taken upon it. On saying that, staff rested its argument that it was properly posted. Technically, staff is stating that the item did meet the noticing requirements; it is up to this body to determine whether or not you are comfortable acting upon the item as it is listed on the agenda. This body should not enter into another 2 hour discussion and not come to any resolution because will hear the same discussion again on May 8th.

Hon. Keith Millhouse stated that in light of this, because of passionate positions on each side of this issue, someone could be very unhappy with whatever decision is made. Rather than delay everything with litigation or challenge, this body should continue this item until the next meeting, noticed as an action item with a specific recommendation from staff.

Hon. Alan Wapner responded that because of the possible delay in the recirculation of the Draft RTP, the region is up against a wall. If the TCC is unable to come to resolution on May 8th and get the Regional Council to approve the Draft RTP there may be a potential problem with regards to time constraint. Regional Council members, who are not members of the TCC, are going to see this huge document for the first time in their agenda packet on May 8th. The RC members will be informed that they have to take action on the item. If the RC does not take action the region will be out of conformity. As the Chair of this body, I do not feel comfortable running up against the May 8th timing for fear that if the Regional Council does not take action, the region comes out of conformity. Hon. Alan Wapner suggested to the committee that the TCC hold another special meeting, specific to the Orangeline, to resolve this issue.

Hon. Tom Sykes, Walnut, stated that his comfort level was getting lower regarding the vote that the committee took earlier on the issue. The only legal opinion that has been heard on this project is from the OLDA's General Counsel, Yvette Abich. I had worked with Ms. Abich previously when I was a City Manager, she was my City Attorney. Ms. Abich was right on the mark when it came to Brown Act issues. The TCC has not heard from SCAG's Legal Counsel on this agenda item as it pertains to the Brown Act other than staff pointing out there is fine print that reads the TCC can take action on any item on the agenda. I do not believe the way this is posted on the agenda would hold up to scrutiny. Since the Orangeline is a highly contested issue, one side or the other is going to take umbrage at the project and scuttle the region into being out of conformity. I am personally in support of another special meeting. It would be procedurally

correct to hold a special meeting because of the items importance. Based on the time factors, there does not appear to be any other option.

Joe Burton, SCAG's Chief Counsel, stated that it was very common that a legislative body be able to act on any item that is posted on an agenda. The particular item on today's agenda was the discussion of the entire Draft RTP. It is appropriate as indicated on today's agenda that the TCC can act upon any item, whether it be an action or information item.

Hon. Alan Wapner stated that in looking at the action language as it reads under Item 2.0, Public Comment Period, it states that the committee can act on any items listed on the agenda. What I find disturbing, is there is a specific area on the agenda that reads Action Items and it read ***no items***. This makes it appear that no action will take place at today's meeting. Although in the Public Comment Period section it reads that the committee can take action, it does not make sense that the language on the purview is posted under the Public Comment Period. To make the purview clearer, it should be posted under the Action Item section.

Hon. Richard Dixon stated that previously in today's meeting, it indicated by Richard Marcus, SCAG, that staff had just received some documented information from the OLDA on their Business Plan but staff had not had an opportunity to analyze the material. A major reason for having a special meeting is to give staff the opportunity to review the information that has come in from the OLDA and determine if the project does or does not meet the guidelines and which portion of the RTP the project should be placed in. This body's decision needs to be based on technically accurate information and not on the emotion of what one county wants to do vs. what another county wants to do.

Additionally, SCAG's teleconferencing protocol stipulates that policy committee members cannot teleconference and participate in the voting process. As a policy committee, there needs to be a physical quorum in attendance at SCAG's downtown office.

Hon. Alan Wapner stated that the Orangeline could be carried over to a special meeting of the TCC with the item on the agenda as an Action Item. The problem is that as a body, the TCC has already taken some actions today that would have to be nullified and taken up all over again.

A motion (Dale) was made to call a special meeting of the TCC to further discuss the 2008 RTP Update as an Action Item. The motion was SECONDED (Garcia) and UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Hon. Carol Gross, Culver City, stated that it need to be made clear on the agenda that the committee will be voting on any items still pending with regard to the RTP and that there be specific recommendations from staff.

Further discussion was taken up regarding the motion.

Hon. Barbara Messina, Alhambra, stated she had a question she wanted to direct to the OLDA. If this does not effect the ability for the Orangeline to continue moving forward by taking it out of the Constrained Plan and putting it into the Strategic Plan, what is the drawback of it being in the Strategic Plan if it does not prohibit the OLDA from continuing the project? Hon. Kurt Cartozian responded that it is not always a problem if a project moves from the Strategic Plan to the Constrained Plan. When a project is moved back and fourth, it does loose credibility that has already been established.

Hon. Lou Bone, Tustin, stated that the TCC that is not the governing board of SCAG, and that the only responsibility of the TCC is to make recommendation and forward to the Regional Council for consideration and approval.

A motion (Dale) was made to call a special meeting of the TCC for purposes of coming up with a consensus regarding approval of the 2008 RTP with a stipulation that the pending action items be specifically laid out as follows:

- the proposed Platinum Triangle-Anaheim Resort Connector in Orange County
- the CETAP Corridor B connecting Riverside with Orange County
- the Orangeline System connecting South Orange County with North Los Angeles County with Maglev High-Speed Rail
- any other project as directed by the TCC

The motion was SECONDED (Garcia). Those OPPOSED (Buckley, Pettis, and Diels) to the motion. The motion was APPROVED.

Hon. Steve Diels, Redondo Beach, asked staff what would happen to the Orangeline if the project is moved from the Constrained Plan and into the Strategic Plan, will the entire Plan then be out of conformity. Hasan Ikhata responded that if any portion of the Plan is questionable financially the answer is yes, the entire Plan would then be in question. Mr. Ikhata assured the committee that SCAG would not bring forward any Plan that was questionable.

Hon. Steven Diels then stated that if at the next special meeting of the TCC there fails to be quorum then the Plan, as it is currently written, is submitted on May 8th to the Regional Council, correct. Mr. Ikhata responded yes, correct. If there is not a quorum of the TCC on April 11th, the last Draft 2008 RTP that was approved by the TCC along with staff opinion as to the outstanding issues, would go to the Regional Council.

The TCC, in closing, agreed that the language regarding the committee being able to take action on any agenda item be moved to another area of the agenda, perhaps directly under the Action Item, where the language would be more visible.

Hon. Alan Wapner clarified for the TCC that any action it previously took on any item in today's meeting was superseded by the last motion to hold the special meeting of the TCC on April 11th.

9.0 CHAIR’S REPORT

None

10.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

None

11.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

SCAG’s General Assembly will take place on May 8th and 9th at the Ontario Convention Center.

12.0 ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. Alan Wapner adjourned the meeting at 11:14 a.m.

The next meeting of the TCC will be held on **Friday April 11, 2008, at the SCAG office in downtown Los Angeles.**

Naresh Amatya, Acting Manager
Transportation Planning Division